

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 7-15 and 19-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 13-15 and 19-25 were amended; Support for the amendments to the claims may be found at least in the specification on page 17 lines 5-10, page 21 lines 9-27, page 25 lines 3-9 and figure 4b, figure 6 and figure 7. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, Claims 1-3, 7-15 and 19-25

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 7-15 and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner states:

It is unclear how the plurality of control points used to generate the fence is chosen. As the claim language is understood all of the outliers have the possibility of being a control point, but it is unclear how, the first set of outliers are chosen. Further it is necessary to explain how an outlier, be it a first or second set of outliers, is identified.

10. Further it is unclear if the first set of outliers, since they comprise the fence and are not "inside" of the fence, are acceptable behaviors.

Office Action dated July 23, 2009, page 4

The applicants have amended independent claims 1, 13 and 25 to overcome these rejections. The amendments to the claims are supported at least in the specification on page 17 lines 5-10, page 21 lines 9-27, page 25 lines 3-9 and figure 4b, figure 6 and figure 7. Therefore the rejection of claims 1-3, 7-15 and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

II. Objection to Claims 13-15 and 19-24

The Examiner has objected to claims 13-15 and 19-24 because of the following informalities:

The language in the preamble is still not in a form the examiner believes will allow for allowance of the case. Examiner recommends the applicant utilize the form approved by the USPTO, in case 5710578 to Beauregard. Examiner would like to see the language read: "*A program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to detect fraudulent activity, said method steps comprising:*" Appropriate correction is required.

Office Action dated July 23, 2009, page 3

The applicants have amended claims 13-15 and 19-24 to overcome these rejections.

III. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: August 27, 2009

ROS/mb

Respectfully submitted,

/Rudolf O. Siegesmund/

Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Reg. No. 37,720
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants